

Date: Wed, 15 Jun 94 11:31:41 PDT
From: Info-Hams Mailing List and Newsgroup <info-hams@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Info-Hams-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Info-Hams Digest V94 #668
To: Info-Hams

Info-Hams Digest Wed, 15 Jun 94 Volume 94 : Issue 668

Today's Topics:

"73's"
** WAITING PERIOD FOR LICENSE ?? **
ARLD035 DX news
Licensing Fees/Waiting time...
subscribe
Valor 2m 70cm glass mount question
You know its time to retire from the hobby when.... (2 msgs)

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Info-Hams-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Info-Hams Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/info-hams".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Wed, 15 Jun 1994 14:30:16 GMT
From: era!era!mark@uunet.uu.net
Subject: "73's"
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

All of this kind of makes me wonder if saying "Seven Three" is
politically incorrect...

SEVEN THREESES ES FEH!

- Mark

.....
: Mark A. Feit, KR4FH : Engineering Research Associates :
: mark@era.com ...!uunet!era!mark : Advanced Communications Division :
.....

Date: 10 Jun 1994 16:51:45 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!library.ucla.edu!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!uhog.mit.edu!wupost!
bigfoot.wustl.edu!cec3!jlw3@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: ** WAITING PERIOD FOR LICENSE ?? **
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Jim Hoffman - Special Programs Manager (jhoffman@shamokin.East.Sun.COM) wrote:

: I called the FCC today to find out the status of my license (passed my initia
: tests on March 11th). I was informed it is now 16 weeks for amateur licenses
: and to call back in a few weeks.

I thought that the new computer system was supposed to *speed* processing up,
not slow it down! I'm really tempted to call about my license again, but I
figured that the latest waiting period I've been quoted is up, and I'll just
wait. Coming up on 6 months (a record?). . .

--jesse (still waiting)

Date: Tue, 14 Jun 1994 17:28:46 EDT
From: yale.edu!noc.near.net!usenet.elf.com!rpi!psinntp!arrl.org!usenet@yale.arpa
Subject: ARLD035 DX news
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

SB DX @ ARL \$ARLD035
ARLD035 DX news

ZCZC AE33
QST de W1AW
DX Bulletin 35 ARLD035

Date: 15 Jun 94 15:13:46 GMT
From: agate!howland.reston.ans.net!swrinde!elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!lll-winken.llnl.gov!
noc.near.net!das-news.harvard.edu!cantaloupe.srv.cs.cmu.edu!dolphin!
ed@ucbvax.berkeley.edu
Subject: Licensing Fees/Waiting time...
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

I Took my no code test march 16th, as of mail yesterday afternoon, no callsign.

I am unhappy to hear from poster that waiting time is now 16 weeks instead
of the previous 12.

I agree that "instant operating" could be abused. I think that the idea of "vec" downloading info into the fcc front end computer would save the fcc data entry work and speed things along.

I personally would be willing to spend \$25-35 bucks to "expedite" my license in 30 days rather than spend \$5.75 or so and have to wait 4 months.

I have already spent over \$275 bucks + traded some stuff for 2 2m ht's, I would not mind that much spending \$30 +/- inorder to use them before the warranty expires!

The hobby loses its attraction when you are forced to wait that long for somebody else to do some paperwork. If I had known that it would take 4 months from test date (not counting study time and time waiting for vec sched) I probably would have found a different radio hobby, or picked up a modem and subscription to compuserve - I do all my ham communicating via internet already.

Ed@fore.com

(can I use an internet address as a radio call sign?) (Kidding) {:-|

Date: 15 Jun 94 15:58:34 GMT
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu
Subject: subscribe
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

subscribe Michael Menninger

Date: 15 Jun 1994 15:51:16 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!math.ohio-state.edu!hobbes.physics.uiowa.edu!
newsrelay.iastate.edu!news.iastate.edu!bwehr@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Valor 2m 70cm glass mount question
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Was wondering if anyone has any experience with the Valor 2/70 glass mount antenna. This thing is \$30 or so cheaper than the Larson and was thinking about getting the thing. If you have any answers please E-Mail me. Reall appreciate any suggestions.

-Brant

Brant Wehr N0UTT
internet bwehr@iastate.edu
Electrical Engineering

--
Brant
bwehr@iastate.edu

Date: Wed, 15 Jun 1994 11:54:28
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!
uhog.mit.edu!news.kei.com!eff!blanket.mitre.org!linus.mitre.org!
newsflash.mitre.org!m14494-pc.mitre.org!mwhite@network.UCSD
Subject: You know its time to retire from the hobby when....
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

...when you say things like "QSO" and "73" in casual, face-to-face
conversations.

73... :-)

Mike, N4PDY

Mike White
mwhite@mitre.org
m14494@mwm.mitre.org
703-883-7923 office
703-430-8402 home

My opinions are my own, not my employer's.

Date: 15 Jun 1994 11:24:21 -0600
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!howland.reston.ans.net!spool.mu.edu!
mnemosyne.cs.du.edu!nyx10.cs.du.edu!not-for-mail@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: You know its time to retire from the hobby when....
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <2tlomh\$aln@cat.cis.brown.edu>,
Michael P. Deignan <md@pstc3.pstc.brown.edu> wrote:
>... you're talking on the phone with a ham buddy, and you end the
>conversation and hang up the phone with a 'KD1HZ clear'.

...you're talking on an EMS telemetry radio with a base hospital for medication orders and such, and sign out with your callsign...

No, I didn't do this, but N5JXS swears he did, and that he got a callsign back...

--
Jay Maynard, EMT-P, K5ZC, PP-ASEL | Never ascribe to malice that which can jmaynard@admin5.hsc.uth.tmc.edu | adequately be explained by stupidity.
To Sarah Brady, Howard Metzenbaum, Dianne Feinstein, and Charles Schumer:
Thanks. Without you, I would be neither a gun owner nor an NRA life member.

Date: 15 Jun 1994 15:43:54 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!library.ucla.edu!psgrain!news.tek.com!tekig7!
gaulandm@network.ucsd.edu
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <2tlomh\$aln@cat.cis.Brown.EDU>, <2tmvlr\$9j@oak.oakland.edu>, <940615103721@emerald.nist.gov>
Subject : Re: You know its time to retire from the hobby when....

You answer your phone, "QRZ?"

--
Michael A. Gauland gaulandm@tekig7.PEN.TEK.COM
AA7JF (503) 627-5067

Date: (null)
From: (null)

Date: Wed, 15 Jun 1994 14:52:20 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!cs.utexas.edu!convex!news.duke.edu!concert!
hearst.acc.Virginia.EDU!cscsun!dtiller@network.ucsd.edu
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <Cr6r4L.68x@freenet.buffalo.edu>, <1994Jun10.133852.1@vax.sonoma.edu>, <940613103026@emerald.nist.gov>8
Subject : Re: FCC Database

James Proctor (proctor@news-reader.nist.gov) wrote:

: Better yet still, try: cs.buffalo.edu 2000
: via Telnet.
: A quick pass through a nameserver will show that (currently)
: electra.cs.buffalo.edu, callsign.cs.buffalo.edu, and cs.buffalo.edu all
: resolve to the same IP address :-). As to which one is "correct" , my guess
: would be callsign.cs..... but that is only a guess. As long as they all
: resolve to the same address, why not use the shortest one.

no No NO!!!! Use the ^%\$!^@%# alias - that's what it's for!!! Just because the server software is on electra today doesn't mean it'll be there tomorrow. If they decide to move it, those of us who respect the alias will never know the difference - those that don't will be out of luck. I'm a network admin and sysadmin here - I know why aliases exist - please use them!

--

David Tiller	Network Administrator	Voice: (804) 752-3710	
dtiller@rmc.edu	n2kau/4	Randolph-Macon College	Fax: (804) 752-7231
Brady Law critique removed	P.O. Box 5005	ICBM: 37d 42' 43.75" N	
due to liberal PC pressure.	Ashland, Va 23005		77d 31' 32.19" W

Date: Wed, 15 Jun 1994 09:31:31 GMT

From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!emory!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary@network.ucsd.edu
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <Cr9Kyq.EwG@news.Hawaii.Edu>, <2ti78m\$q4l@abyss.west.sun.com>, <2tihqv\$e4q@nyx10.cs.du.edu>

Reply-To : gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary Coffman)

Subject : Re: Microwave bands (was Re: End of '440 in SoCal' thread)

In article <2tihqv\$e4q@nyx10.cs.du.edu> jmaynard@nyx10.cs.du.edu (Jay Maynard) writes:

>In article <2ti78m\$q4l@abyss.west.sun.com>,
>Dana Myers <myers@bigboy.West.Sun.COM> wrote:
>>Not exactly. The microwave bands may be useful for point-point
>>linking, etc., but aren't commonly used, even by the business or
>>government agencies, for mobile communications as we know it.

>
>Why not? I know some work in that area has been done by the North Texas
>Microwave Society...

Handhelds, or mobile in motion? That's the purpose served by VHF/UHF repeaters, supporting handheld and mobile in motion stations. Microwave almost demands high gain directional arrays. They're small enough in many cases to be carried by vehicle, witness broadcast ENG vehicles, but they aren't suitable for mobile in motion work. Unless the distance

is really short and true line of sight, omni-directional microwave stations aren't very effective.

>>Procuring parts and building working gear for microwave bands is
>>considerably more difficult than building 80m transmitters out
>>of junk televisions.

>

>Building 80m transmitters was, once upon a time, difficult and expensive, too.
>Hams changed that.

>

>> I agree amateurs should indeed get involved
>>on these bands, but these bands are not necessarily valid replacement
>>spectrum for the functions filled by 2m, 70cm, 33cm and 23cm.

>

>Why not? Those who claim that the purpose of ham radio is solely or primarily
>technological advancement have a golden opportunity to prove that hams can
>still contribute.

And indeed some amateurs *are* using the microwave bands, and more should, but it isn't valid replacement spectrum for mobile in motion and handheld use. Many fixed point to point links can be moved to microwave fairly easily, and should be to free up spectrum better suited for mobile in motion uses.

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV		You make it,		gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems		we break it.		uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way		Guaranteed!		emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244				

Date: Wed, 15 Jun 1994 09:23:31 GMT

From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!emory!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary@network.ucsd.edu
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <2td3t2\$6gd@ccnet.ccnet.com>, <Cr9Kyq.EwG@news.Hawaii.Edu>,
<2ti78m\$q41@abyss.West.Sun.COM>

Reply-To : gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary Coffman)

Subject : Re: Microwave bands (was Re: End of '440 in SoCal' thread)

In article <2ti78m\$q41@abyss.West.Sun.COM> myers@bigboy.West.Sun.COM (Dana Myers) writes:

>In article <Cr9Kyq.EwG@news.Hawaii.Edu> jherman@uhunix3.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu (Jeffrey Herman) writes:

>>In article <2td3t2\$6gd@ccnet.ccnet.com> sohn@ccnet.com (Jim Sohn) writes:

>>>

>>>Don't know what your source is, but the US amateurs in ITU region 2 have
>>>access to 275 MHz in the 5.8 GHz band alone, and another 750 MHz in the 10
>>>and 24 GHz bands. These allocations are valuable - just ask any business
>>>or government agency that operates their own network on similar
>>>frequencies.

>>

>>Jim's statement above should bring to an end the '440 in SoCal'
>>thread. Those are incredibly huge chunks of spectrum that need to be
>>put to use. When you consider the amount of unused spectrum we have
>>it really makes the 440 debate moot.

>

>Not exactly. The microwave bands may be useful for point-point
>linking, etc., but aren't commonly used, even by the business or
>government agencies, for mobile communications as we know it.

That's true. Highly directional arrays are required for respectable
range at microwave. That's simply not workable for many mobile uses.

>>Can't readily *buy* a radio to play with up on those UHF freqs? Put your
>>amateur skills to use and *build* something for up there. [Roger: I'll
>>send you my soldering iron if you don't already have one.]

>

>Procuring parts and building working gear for microwave bands is
>considerably more difficult than building 80m transmitters out
>of junk televisions. I agree amateurs should indeed get involved
>on these bands, but these bands are not necessarily valid replacement
>spectrum for the functions filled by 2m, 70cm, 33cm and 23cm.

However, building microwave equipment isn't that hard today. The
parts needed are available, and not very expensive. The building
techniques are different, but not difficult to master. The savior
is high gain directional antennas. They're relatively easy to build,
and make up to a large extent for the difficulty in obtaining high
RF power levels at microwave. Microwave is a valid substitute for
UHF over many point to point links. Video quality terrestrial links
are possible out to 50 miles with 1 watt signals in many cases.

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV		You make it,		gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems		we break it.		uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way		Guaranteed!		emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244				

Date: Wed, 15 Jun 1994 09:13:40 GMT

From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!emory!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary@network.ucsd.edu

To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <Cr9Kyq.EwG@news.Hawaii.Edu>, <2ti78m\$q4l@abyss.West.Sun.COM>, <2tj6rp\$7mi@ccnet.ccnet.com>

Reply-To : gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary Coffman)

Subject : Re: Microwave bands (was Re: End of '440 in SoCal' thread)

In article <2tj6rp\$7mi@ccnet.ccnet.com> sohn@ccnet.com (Jim Sohn) writes:

> Not exactly. The microwave bands may be useful for point-point
> linking, etc., but aren't commonly used, even by the business or
> government agencies, for mobile communications as we know it.

>

>How about the entire GPS system? How about the INMARSAT system? How
>about all the satellite links on shipboard? How about all that military
>stuff they don't want you to know about?

All direct line of sight paths, and the amateur satellites all use 70 cm
for up or down links so current satellites aren't of much help in releasing
70 cm of activity.

>Some enterprising amateurs have indeed operated mobile above 1300MHz. I
>personally operated mobile-in-motion full-color ATV on 5.8 GHz. Remember,
>it wasn't too long ago that the common belief was that mobile operation
>above 500 MHz wasn't feasible. If that barrier hadn't been broken, there
>would be no cellular service!

Cellular is also short range line of sight, or near line of sight
usage. Cellsites on average serve a 3 mile radius. At 800 MHz,
it's more high UHF than microwave in its propagation characteristics
as well.

>As an alternative (and less innovative),
>one could always take the point-to-point stuff out of the current
>mobile-friendly bands. This would make more room for the current mobile
>technology and put point-to-point stuff on frequencies which are more
>suited to it.

This is a good idea. High gain directional antennas can compensate for
the greater path loss of microwaves in many cases, so beyond horizon
communications over point to point paths under normal propagation
conditions are still possible. Many links, especially packet backbones,
are over paths of 90 miles or more due to the sparse nature of the
network. That's tougher, except between mountaintops, at microwave.
Path lengths under 50 miles, however, only require modest towers of
100-200 feet to be workable. If the FCC acts favorably on the ARRL
petition for 219 MHz, most longer packet links can be moved there.
Getting ATV off of the 420-430 segment would also open up more room
for mobile FM voice activity. There's little reason microwaves can't

be used for most ATV activity, and besides, FM video works better than AM.

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV		You make it,	gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems		we break it.	uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way		Guaranteed!	emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244			

Date: Wed, 15 Jun 1994 10:03:46 GMT

From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!emory!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary@network.ucsd.edu
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <Cr9Kyq.EwG@news.Hawaii.Edu>, <CrBrC4.Fn9@news.Hawaii.Edu>, <hk1NH11.edellers@delphi.com>

Reply-To : gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary Coffman)

Subject : Re: End of '440 in SoCal' thread (was: VHF Maritime Outrage!!)

In article <hk1NH11.edellers@delphi.com> Ed Ellers <edellers@delphi.com> writes:

>Jeffrey Herman <jherman@uhunix.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu> writes:

>

>>Wow! No need to whine about 440 when we've got all THIS available.

>

>Are FM transceivers for those bands as readily available as those for 440?

No, but then neither were they widely available for 2 meters or 70 cm a few years ago. Open systems can, however, encourage enough interest and activity to make it worthwhile for commercial manufacturers to produce equipment. That's how 2 meters took off, activity reached a critical mass to support a market. The same open systems approach encouraged enough activity, except in Southern California and a few other closed minded locations, to get dual band radios off the ground.

>Is "homebrewing" as practical on those bands as on 440 -- referring to >special construction techniques as well as availability of components that can >operate at those higher frequencies?

Yes homebrewing is practical. The techniques are *different* but not harder. Parts are available, some as close as your microwave oven.

>Are propagation characteristics on those bands such that they are as suitable >for FM voice communication as is 440?

Here's where it gets interesting. Because of the different path loss characteristics of microwave, you need either direct line of sight

or high gain directional antennas to make paths usable in the absence of unusual propagation conditions. At least through 2.3 GHz, cellular techniques can be used to keep the paths required for omni handhelds and mobiles in motion reasonable. Fixed path links can use large arrays to make longer paths functional in the absence of severe terrain blockage.

Cellular should come to metro amateur operations. It's spectrally efficient. However, it does require many more fixed sites than conventional VHF/UHF repeaters, and quite a bit of fairly sophisticated linking equipment. That's not beyond amateur means, but the increased degree of cooperation required to install, maintain, and operate such systems may be, as witness this thread on closed systems. The expense of cellular systems dictates that there only be one or two per metro area. Several closed systems wouldn't be supportable. To be viable, the systems would have to be open to all amateurs, and to some degree supported by all amateurs, if only by building a large enough market for commercially produced equipment. Cellular is also not as suitable in areas of sparse amateur population. There aren't enough resources available in most rural areas to support the required number of sites.

Fixed point to point microwave links, however, can be used in many cases instead of VHF/UHF. Most 30 mile and less paths can be moved to microwave fairly easily. Only on extremely long paths is the VHF spectrum still better because of the need for fewer relay sites. Such is the case for spanning long rural paths between cities. For packet, spectrum at 219 MHz may be coming available for that purpose.

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV		You make it,		gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems		we break it.		uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way		Guaranteed!		emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244				

Date: 15 Jun 1994 17:17:47 GMT

From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!library.ucla.edu!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!
newsxfer.itd.umich.edu!news1.oakland.edu!vela.acs.oakland.edu!
prvalko@network.ucsd.edu
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <2tmvlr\$9j@oak.oakland.edu>, <940615103721@emerald.nist.gov>,
<2tn7jq\$bsf@tekadm1.cse.tek.com>kla
Subject : Re: You know its time to retire from the hobby when....

Your wife points out that all of your children were born during sunspot minimums.

73! =paul= wb8zjl

Date: Wed, 15 Jun 1994 10:14:30 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!emory!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary@network.ucsd.edu
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <2tct8t\$4jp@cat.cis.Brown.EDU>, <RFM.94Jun13141144@urth.eng.sun.com>, <061494152337Rnf0.78@dream1.wariat.org>
Reply-To : gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary Coffman)
Subject : Re: VHF Maritime Outrage!!

In article <061494152337Rnf0.78@dream1.wariat.org> jga@dream1.wariat.org (Jon Anhold N8USK) writes:

>The one thing I find so amusing about this thread is that all of the
>people who are arguing that \$7/yr is too much are forgetting one simple
>thing: IT'S ONLY IF YOU WANT A VANITY CALLSIGN!!! If you don't want to pay
>\$7/yr, FINE! Keep the callsign the FCC issued you and shut up. \$7/yr to
>pick your own call is still a very reasonable amount of money, and if you
>don't want to pay it, you don't have to.

Today you don't have to pay it, but as witness the VHF Marine situation,
this "reasonable" fee is only the foot in the door to higher taxes in
the future. If people had known that the "reasonable" Federal Income
Tax would grow to the income grabbing monster it's become back when
the income tax was imposed, they would have screamed too. At it's beginning,
the FIT was only 2% and only affected people with incomes over \$10,000
a year, which was only well off people back then.

Gary

--
Gary Coffman KE4ZV | You make it, | gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems | we break it. | uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way | Guaranteed! | emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244 | |

End of Info-Hams Digest V94 #668
